(Old) Okinawan and Old Japanese KM in functional and diachronic perspective: Part I
Rumiko Shinzato

Comparing Old Okinawan (OOk) and Old Japanese (OJ) *kakari* particles (KP), we first highlight two KP groupings: Group I occurs in both lineages, unlike Group II. Group-I KPs originated from demonstratives, unlike Group II. Cognate KPs show parallel deictic distances: proximal (|koso| :: |su|<*kö#swo, |i|<*i#swo), mesial (|zo| :: |do|), and distal (|ka| :: |ga|).

(1)   OOk   OJ

    Group I: proximal |su| (*-sɨ*, *-syu*), |i| (*-i*) |koso| (*kösö*)

               mesial |do| (*-du*, *-dyu*, *-ru*) |zo| (*sö, zö*)

               distal |ga| (*-ga*, *-gya*) |ka| (*ka*)

    Group II: ——   Ø |ya| (*ya*)

               ——   Ø |namu| (*namu, namo*)

OOk |su| is the remnant of proximal+noun 'thing'. Note that OOk |su| and |i| both appear in *Omoro Sōshi*:

 (2) a. katana   ʔuc-yi-**yi**   dya-kunyi tuyum-y-uwar-**i** (1:5)

       b. katana   ʔuc-yi-**sɨ**   dya-kunyi tuyum-y-uwar-**i** (3:123)

          sword   strike-RY-**KP** great-land resound-ry-EX-**iz**

          'It is with sword at his side that he is renowned in the great land.'

Secondly, we stress the space-, function-, and conjugation- parallelism:

(3) |su|/|koso| Proximal   Strong assertion   IZ (*Izenkei*)

      |do|/|zo| Mesial   Assertion/*wh*-question   RT (*Rentaikei*)

      |ga|/|ka| Distal   Other-inquiry   RT

                                Doubt   RT+IA (InferAux)/ MZ (*Mizenkei*)

Thirdly, the correspondences in (3) are not arbitrary, but iconicity-based: the closer something is to the speaker, the more real it is. The functional contrast between assertion and question/doubt indicates the degree of such epistemic contrast (certainty vs. uncertainty). The mapping of space and conjugation onto *Izen*(*kei*) 'certainty' vs. *Mizen*(*kei*) (=IA-*wo*_RT) 'uncertainty' is a corollary to this. The mesial KPs |zo| :: |do| take an intermediate position both spatially and epistemically, forming both assertions and questions.

The combinations of KPs and functions have rarely been discussed; this paper attempts to fill that gap. In gramaticalization studies, it adds another dimension to the well-known {demonstratives → focus} path due to its inclusion of three demonstratives.